Jong-PhilLæ and Gye T.Park^y

Department of Physics and IPAP, Yonsei University, Seoul, 120-749, Korea

Abstract

Subleading Isgur-W ise form factor (v v⁰) at O (1=m_Q) for b! ${}_{c1}^{1=2;3=2}$ weak transition is calculated by using the QCD sum rules in the framework of the heavy quark elective theory (HQET), where ${}_{c1}^{1=2}$ and ${}_{c1}^{3=2}$ are the orbitally excited charmed baryon doublet with $J^P = (1 = 2; 3 = 2)$. We consider the subleading contributions from the weak current matching in the HQET. The interpolating currents with transverse covariant derivative are adopted for ${}_{c1}^{1=2}$ and ${}_{c1}^{3=2}$ in the analysis. The slope parameter ² in linear approxim ation of is obtained to be ² = 2:76 and the interception to be (1) = 1:27 GeV.

Typeset using REV T_EX

email: ple@phya.yonsei.ac.kr

^yem ail gtpark@phya.yonsei.ac.kr

The ground state bottom baryon $_{\rm b}$ weak decays [1] provide a testing ground for the standard m odel (SM). They reveal som e in portant features of the physics of bottom quark. The experim ental data on these decays have been accumulated to wait for reliable theoretical calculations. W ith the discovery of the orbitally excited charmed baryons $_{\rm c}$ (2593) and $_{\rm c}$ (2625) [2], it would be of great interest for one to investigate the $_{\rm b}$ sem ileptonic decays

into these baryons.

From the phenom enological point of view, these sem ileptonic transitions are interesting since in principle they m ay account for a sizeable fraction of the inclusive sem ileptonic rate of $_{\rm b}$ decay. In addition, the properties of excited baryons have attracted attention in recent years. Investigation on them will extend our ability in the application of QCD. It can also help us foresse any other excited heavy baryons that have not been discovered yet.

The heavy quark symmetry [3] is a useful tool to classify the hadronic spectroscopy containing a heavy quark Q. In the in nite mass limit, the spin and parity of the heavy quark and that of the light degrees of freedom are separately conserved. Coupling the spin of light degrees of freedom j, with the spin of heavy quark $s_0 = 1=2$ yields a doublet with total spin J = j, 1=2 (or a singlet if $j_1 = 0$). This classication can be applied to the $_0$ -type baryons. For the charm ed baryons the ground state $_c$ contains light degrees of freedom with spin-parity $j_1^p = 0^+$, being a singlet. The excited states with $j_1^p = 1$ are spin symmetry doublet with J^p (1 =2,3 =2). The lowest states of such excited charm ed states, $_{c1}^{1=2}$ and $_{c1}^{3=2}$, have been observed to be identied with $_c$ (2593) and $_c$ (2625) respectively [2].

However, the di culties in the SM calculations are mainly due to the poor understanding of the nonperturbative aspects of the strong interaction (QCD). The heavy quark e ective theory (HQET) based on the heavy quark sym metry provides a model-independent method for analyzing heavy hadrons containing a single heavy quark [3]. It allows us to expand the physical quantity in powers of $1=m_0$ system atically, where m_0 is the heavy quark mass.

2

W ithin this fram ework, the classi cation of the $_{b}$ exclusive weak decay form factors has been greatly simplied. The decays such as $_{b}$! $_{c}$ l [4], $_{b}$! $_{c}^{()}$ l [5], $_{b}$! $_{c}^{()}$ l [6], $_{b}$! p() [7] have been studied.

To obtain detailed predictions for the hadrons, at this point, som e nonperturbative QCD m ethods are also required. W e have adopted QCD sum rules [8] in this work. QCD sum rule is a powerful nonperturbative m ethod based on QCD. It takes into account the nontrivial QCD vacuum which is param etrized by various vacuum condensates in order to describe the nonperturbative nature. In QCD sum rule, hadronic observables can be calculated by evaluating two-or three-point correlation functions. The hadronic currents for constructing the correlation functions are expressed by the interpolating elds. In describing the excited heavy baryons, transverse covariant derivative is included in the interpolating eld. The static properties of $_{\rm b}$ and $_{\rm cl}$ ($_{\rm cl}$ denotes the generic $j_{\rm c}^{\rm p} = 1$ charm ed state) have been studied with QCD sum rules in the HQET in Ref. [9] and Ref. [10,11], respectively. Recently, the leading order Isgur-W ise (IW) function is also calculated in the HQET QCD sum rule in Ref. [12].

In $_{\rm b}$! $_{\rm cl}$ decay, $1=m_{\rm Q}$ corrections are very in portant. At the heavy quark lim it of $m_{\rm Q}$! 1, the transition matrix elements should vanish at zero recoil since the light degrees of freedom change their con gurations. Nonvanishing contribution to, say, B ($_{\rm b}$! $_{\rm cl}$ ') at zero recoil appears at $1=m_{\rm Q}$ order. Since both $_{\rm b}$ and $_{\rm cl}$ are heavy enough, the behavior of the matrix elements near the zero recoil is very in portant. That explains why people pay attention to the next-to-leading order (NLO) contributions. The same situation occurs in heavy mesons. As for B ! $D_1(D_2)$ ' decay, leading and subleading Isgur-W ise (IW) functions have been computed using QCD sum rule in Ref. [13(17]. They showed that the branching ratio is enhanced considerably when the subleading contributions are included.

In HQET, $1=m_Q$ corrections appear in a two-fold way. At the Lagrangian level, subleading terms are summarized in $_1$ and $_2$. $_1$ parametrizes the kinetic term of higher derivative, while $_2$ represents the chrom on agnetic interaction which explicitly breaks the heavy quark spin symmetry. At the current level, $1=m_Q$ corrections come from the small

3

portion of the heavy quark elds which correspond to the virtual motion of the heavy quark. In this work, the subleading IW function from the latter case, i.e., at the current level, is analyzed in the HQET QCD sum rules.

In Sec. II, the weak transition matrix elements are parametrized by the leading and subleading IW functions. By evaluating the three-point correlation function, we give the subleading IW function in Sec. III. We present, in Sec. IV, the numerical analysis and discussions. The summary is given in Sec. V.

II.W EAK TRANSITION MATRIX ELEMENTS AND THE SUBLEADING ISGUR-W ISE FUNCTIONS

The weak transition matrix elements for $_{\rm b}$! $_{\rm c1}$ are parametrized by the 14-form factors as

$$\frac{h \frac{1}{c_1} (v^0; s^0) \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j}_{b} (v; s) \mathbf{i}}{P \frac{1}{4M} \frac{1}{c_1 (1-2)M}} = u \frac{h}{c_1} (v^0; s^0) \mathbf{F}_1 + \mathbf{F}_2 \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{F}_3 \mathbf{v}^0 \frac{1}{5} u \mathbf{v}_{b} (v; s) ; \qquad (1a)$$

$$\frac{h_{c1}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{0};s^{0})}{P}\frac{\dot{A}_{b}(v;s)i}{4M_{c1}(1=2)M_{b}} = u_{c1}(v^{0};s^{0})G_{1} + G_{2}v + G_{3}v^{0}u_{b}(v;s);$$
(1b)

$$\frac{h \frac{3}{c_1} (v^0; s^0) \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j}_{b} (v; s) \mathbf{i}}{P \frac{4M_{c_1} (3=2)M_{b}}{4M_{c_1} (3=2)M_{b}}} = u_{c_1} (v^0; s^0) \mathbf{v} (\mathbf{K}_1 + \mathbf{K}_2 \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{K}_3 \mathbf{v}^0) + \mathbf{K}_4 \mathbf{g} \mathbf{u}_{b} (v; s); \quad (1c)$$

$$\frac{h \frac{3}{c_{1}}}{P} \frac{(v^{0}; s^{0}) A j_{b}(v; s) i}{4M_{c_{1}(3=2)}M_{b}} = u_{c_{1}}(v^{0}; s^{0}) v_{0}(N_{1} + N_{2}v + N_{3}v^{0}) + N_{4}g_{5}(v; s);$$
(1d)

where $v(v^0)$ and $s(s^0)$ are the four-velocity and spin of $b(c_1)$, respectively. And the form factors F_i , G_i , K_i and N_i are functions of $y = v = \sqrt[6]{2}$. In the limit of $m_Q = 1$, all the form factors are related to one independent universal form factor (y) called Isgur-W ise (IW) function. A convenient way to evaluate hadronic matrix elements is by introducing interpolating elds in HQET developed in Ref. [18] to parametrize the matrix elements in Eqs. (1). W ith the aid of this method the matrix element can be written as [19]

$$c b = h_{v^0}^{(c)} h_{v}^{(b)} = (y)v_{v^0} v$$
 (2)

at leading order in $1=m_Q$ and s, where is any collection of -m atrices. The ground state eld, v, destroys the baryon with four-velocity v; the spinor eld v is given by

$$y = \frac{3=2}{v} + \frac{1}{p_{\overline{3}}}(v + v) = \frac{1}{5} \frac{1}{v} ; \qquad (3)$$

where $v_v^{1=2}$ is the ordinary D irac spinor and $v_v^{3=2}$ is the spin 3/2 R arita-Schwinger spinor, they destroy $v_{c1}^{1=2}$ and $v_{c1}^{3=2}$ baryons with four-velocity v, respectively. To be explicit,

$$F_{1} = \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{3} (y \quad 1) \quad (y) ; \quad G_{1} = \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{3} (y + 1) \quad (y) ;$$

$$F_{2} = G_{2} = \frac{2}{p} \frac{2}{3} \quad (y) ; \quad K_{1} = N_{1} = (y) ;$$
(others) = 0 : (4)

In general, the IW form factor is a decreasing function of the four velocity transfery. Since the kinematically allowed region of y for heavy to heavy transition is very narrow around unity,

1 y
$$\frac{M_{b}^{2} + M_{c1}^{2}}{2M_{b}M_{c1}}$$
 / 13; (5)

and hence it is convenient to approximate the IW function linearly as

$$(y) = (1) (1 \ ^{2} (y \ 1));$$
 (6)

where 2 is the slope parameter which characterizes the shape of the leading IV function.

The $_{QCD} = m_Q$ corrections come in two ways. One is from the subleading Lagrangian of the HQET while the other comes from the small portion of the heavy quark eld to modify the eld to modify the eld to modify consider the latter case here.

Including $Q_{CD} = m_b$ and $Q_{CD} = m_c$, the weak current is given by

$$c b = h_{v^0}^{(c)}$$
 $\frac{i}{2m_c} \not > + \frac{i}{2m_b} \not > h_v^{(b)}$: (7)

K eeping the Lorentz structure, the subleading term s are expanded in general as

where $i^{(Q)}$ are the subleading IV functions to be evaluated.

The matrix elements of these currents modify Eq. (4) as

$$p_{3F_{1}} = (y_{1}) + (y_{1}) + (y_{1}) + (y_{2}) + (y_{3}) + (y_{3}) + (y_{1}) + (y_{1}) + (y_{2}) + (y_{3}) + (y_{3}) + (y_{2}) + (y_{1}) + (y_{2}) + (y_{3}) + (y_{2}) + (y_{3}) + (y_{2}) + (y_{2}) + (y_{3}) + ($$

where $_{Q}$ 1=2m $_{Q}$. It is quite convenient to de ne

(c)
$$(+v^0)_5 \frac{1+v^0}{2} \frac{1+v}{2};$$
 (10a)

(b)
$$(+v^0)_5 \frac{1+\psi^0}{2} \frac{1+\psi}{2}$$
: (10b)

Possible contractions of are listed in the Appendix. From the Eqs. (3) and (8), Eq. (1) can be reexpressed in terms of $i^{(Q)}$ and :

$$\frac{h \frac{1}{c_1}}{P} \frac{(v^0; s^0) j j_b (v; s) j}{4M_{c_1 (l=2)} M_b} = \frac{1}{P \frac{1}{3}} u_{c_1} (v^0; s^0) v v^0 (c) c_1 v v + \frac{(c)}{2} v v^0 + \frac{(c)}{3} g (c)$$

$$+ {}_{b} {}_{1}^{(b)} v v + {}_{2}^{(b)} v v^{0} + {}_{3}^{(b)} g {}^{(b)} u {}_{b} (v;s) ; \qquad (11)$$

(12)

A similar expression can be obtained for the spin-3/2 nal states

$$\frac{h \frac{3}{2}}{\frac{c_{1}}{p} \frac{d_{1}}{4M} \frac{d_{1}}{d_{1}} \frac{d_{2}}{d_{2}} M_{b}} = u \frac{h}{d_{1}} v \frac{h}{q} + u \frac{h}{d_{1}} \frac{h}{d_{2}} v \frac{h}{d_{2}} + u \frac{h}{d_{2}} v \frac{h}{d_{2}} v \frac{h}{d_{2}} + u \frac{h}{d_{2}} v \frac{h}{d_{2}} v \frac{h}{d_{2}} v \frac{h}{d_{2}} + u \frac{h}{d_{2}} v \frac$$

III.QCD SUM RULE EVALUATION

As a starting point of QCD sum rule calculation, let us consider the interpolating eld of heavy baryons. The heavy baryon current is generally expressed as

$$j_{J,P}^{v}(x) = _{ijk} [q^{iT}(x)C_{J,P}(q^{j}(x))]_{J,P}^{0} h_{v}^{k}(x) ; \qquad (14)$$

where i; j; k are the color indices, C is the charge conjugation matrix, and is the isospin matrix while q(x) is a light quark eld. $_{J,P}$ and $_{J,P}^{0}$ are some gamma matrices which describe the structure of the baryon with spin-parity J^{P} . U sually and 0 with least number of derivatives are used in the QCD sum rule method. The sum rules then have better convergence in the high energy region and often have better stability. For the ground state heavy baryon, we use $_{1=2;+} = _{5}$, $_{1=2;+}^{0} = 1$. In the previous work [10], two kinds of interpolating elds are introduced to represent the excited heavy baryon. In this work, we not that only the interpolating eld of transverse derivative is adequate for the analysis. Nonderivative interpolating eld results in a vanishing perturbative contribution. The choice of and 0 with derivatives for the $_{c1}^{1=2}$ and $_{c1}^{3=2}$ is then

where a transverse vector A_t is defined to be A_t A v v A, and M in Eq. (15) is some hadronic mass scale. a, b are arbitrary numbers between 0 and 1.

The baryonic decay constants in the HQET are de ned as follows,

$$h0 j_{1=2,+}^{v} j_{b} i = f_{b,v};$$
 (16a)

$$h0 jj_{1=2}^{v}, j_{c1}^{1=2} i = f_{1=2} v_{v}^{1=2};$$
(16b)

$$h0 jj_{3=2}^{v}$$
; $j_{c1}^{3=2} i = \frac{1}{p_{3}} f_{3=2} v_{v}^{3=2}$; (16c)

where $f_{1=2}$ and $f_{3=2}$ are equivalent since $\begin{array}{c}1=2\\c1\end{array}$ and $\begin{array}{c}3=2\\c1\end{array}$ belong to the same doublet with $j_{s}^{P}=1$. The QCD sum rule calculations give [9]

$$f_{b}^{2}e^{=T} = \frac{1}{20^{4}} \int_{0}^{2} d! !^{5}e^{!=T} + \frac{1}{6}hqqi^{2}e^{m} \int_{0}^{2} e^{3T^{2}} + \frac{h_{s}GGi}{32^{3}}T^{2}; \qquad (17)$$

and [10]

$$M^{2}f_{1=2}^{2}e^{-0} = \int_{0}^{2} d! \frac{3N_{c}!}{4^{4}} \frac{1}{7!} (24a^{2} + 40b^{2})e^{!=T^{0}} + \frac{h_{s}GGi}{32^{3}}T^{0}(a^{2} + b^{2}) + \frac{N_{c}!}{2^{2}}hqqiT^{0}(16ab)hqg \quad GqiT^{0}ab \quad \frac{hqg}{4^{2}} \frac{Gqi}{4^{2}}T^{0}(3ab):$$
(18)

In the above equations, T $^{(0)}$ are the Borel parameters and $!_{c}^{(0)}$ are the continuum thresholds, and N_c = 3 is the color number. In the heavy quark lim it, the mass parameters and $^{(0)}$ are de ned as

$${}^{0} = M {}_{Q1} {} m_{Q} ; \qquad = M {}_{Q} {} m_{Q} : \qquad (19)$$

The main point in QCD sum rules for the IW function is to study the analytic properties of the 3-point correlators,

$$\frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}} (!;!^{0};y) = i^{2} d^{4}x d^{4}z e^{i(k^{0} \times k \times z)} h_{0} j_{1=2;}^{v^{0}} (x) h_{v^{0}}^{(c)} (0) h_{v}^{(b)} (0) j_{1=2;+}^{v} (z) j_{$$

$$\frac{3}{2} (!;!^{0};y) = i^{2} d^{4}x d^{4}z e^{i(k^{0} \times k \times z)} h_{0} j_{3=2;}^{v^{0}} (x) h_{v^{0}}^{(c)} (0) h_{v}^{(b)} (0) j_{3=2;+}^{v} (z) j_{1}^{(c)}$$

$$= \int_{hadron} (!;!^{0};y) + v c_{1}^{(c)}v v + \int_{2}^{(c)}v v^{0} + \int_{3}^{(c)}g + \int_{2}^{(c)}v v + \int_{2}^{(c)}v v + \int_{3}^{(c)}v v + \int_{2}^{(c)}v v + \int_{3}^{(c)}g + \int_{3}^{(c)}v v + \int_{2}^{(c)}v v + \int_{3}^{(c)}v v + \int_{3}^{(c)}v$$

The variables k, k^0 denote residual \o -shell" m om enta which are related to the m om enta P of the heavy quark in the initial state and P⁰ in the nal state by $k = P \quad m_Q v$, $k^0 = P^0 \quad m_Q \circ v^0$, respectively. The coe cient $(!;!)^{0}$; y)_{hadron} in Eq. (20) is an analytic function in the $\langle 0 - shell en$ ergies" ! = v + k and $! = v^{0} + k$ with discontinuities for positive values of these variables. It furthermore depends on the velocity transfer y = v + k, which is xed at its physical region for the process under consideration. By saturating with physical interm ediate states in HQET, one - nds the hadronic representation of the correlators as following

hadron (!; !⁰; y) =
$$\frac{f_{1=2}f_{b}}{(0 !)(1 !)} + \text{ higher resonances :}$$
(21)

In obtaining the above expression the D irac and R artia-Schwinger spinor sum s

have been used, where $g_t = g v v$.

In the quark-gluon language, $(!;!)_{\frac{1}{2};\frac{3}{2}}$ in Eq. (20) is written as

$$(!;!^{0};y)_{\frac{1}{2};\frac{3}{2}} = \int_{0}^{\mathbb{Z}_{1}} d d \left(\int_{0}^{0} \frac{\operatorname{pert}(;^{0};y)}{(\cdot,!)(\cdot,^{0},!^{0})} + \operatorname{(subtraction)} + \operatorname{(cond}(!;!^{0};y); \right) \right)$$
(23)

where the perturbative spectral density function pert (; 0 ;y) and the condensate contribution cond are related to the calculation of the Feynm an diagram s depicted in Fig.1. In Eq. (23), the -structures of spin-1/2 and 3/2 are the sam e as those in Eq. (20), respectively. Subleading IW functions, $^{(Q)}_{i}$, obtained from spin-1/2 and 3/2 are therefore identical.

The six $\int_{i}^{Q} (Q = c;b; i = 1;2;3)$ are not independent. From the fact that

$$i\theta (h_{v^{0}}^{(c)} h_{v}^{(b)}) = h_{v^{0}}^{(c)} (iD + iD)h_{v}^{(b)} = (v v^{0})h_{v^{0}}^{(c)} h_{v}^{(b)};$$
(24)

Eq.(8) implies

$$\binom{(c)}{1} + \binom{(b)}{1}vv + \binom{(c)}{2} + \binom{(b)}{2}vv^{0} + \binom{(c)}{3} + \binom{(b)}{3}g = (vv^{0}v^{0})v(y):$$
 (25)

The above expression relates ${}^{(c)}_i$ with ${}^{(b)}_i$ as

$${}_{1}^{(c)} + {}_{1}^{(b)} = ;$$
 (26a)

$${}_{2}^{(c)} + {}_{2}^{(b)} = {}_{0}^{0}$$
; (26b)

$$_{3}^{(c)} + _{3}^{(b)} = 0$$
: (26c)

O ther relations are obtained from the equation of motion of the heavy quark, v $D h^{(2)} = 0$:

$$h_{v^0}^{(c)}$$
 iv $D \quad h_v^{(b)} = {}_{v^0} \quad y_1^{(c)} + {}_{2}^{(c)} \quad v = 0$; (27a)

$$h_{v^{0}}^{(c)}$$
 iv $\dot{D} h_{v}^{(b)} = {}_{v^{0}} {}_{1}^{(b)} + y {}_{2}^{(b)} + {}_{c}^{(b)} {}_{v} = 0$; (27b)

From the above 5 equations in Eq. (26), (27), all the six subleading IV functions are reduced to only one independent form factor. We just pick up $\frac{(b)}{1}(y)$ (y), then others are

$$_{1}^{(c)} = ;$$
 (28a)

$$_{2}^{(c)} = y + y ;$$
 (28b)

$$y_{3}^{(c)} = y(y^{0}) (y^{2} 1);$$
 (28c)

$${}_{2}^{(b)} = (y {}^{0}) y ;$$
 (28d)

$$_{3}^{(b)} = y(y ^{0}) + (y^{2} 1) ;$$
 (28e)

Now that all the subleading IW functions are related to (y), we have only to extract the coe cient of v v $^{(b)}$ (or $_{+}$ v v for spin 3/2) in Eqs. (20) and (23).

The QCD sum rule is obtained by equating the phenom enological and theoretical expressions for . In doing this the quark-hadron duality needs to be assumed to model the contributions of higher resonance part of Eq. (21). Generally speaking, the duality is to simulate the resonance contribution by the perturbative part above some thresholds $!_c$ and $!_c^0$, that is

In the QCD sum rule analysis for B sem ileptonic decays into ground state D m esons, it was argued by N eubert in [20], and B lok and Shifm an in [21] that the perturbative and the hadronic spectral densities can not be locally dual to each other, and therefore the necessary way to restore duality is to integrate the spectral densities over the $\langle 0 - diagonal$ " variable $= \frac{q}{\frac{y+1}{y-1}} (1 - q) = 2$, keeping the $\langle diagonal$ " variable q = (1 + q) = 2 xed. It is in $q = \frac{1}{y-1} = 1$

that the quark-hadron duality is assumed for the integrated spectral densities. The same prescription shall be adopted in the following analysis. On the other hand, in order to suppress the contributions of higher resonance states a double Borel transformation in ! and $!^{0}$ is performed to both sides of the sum rule, which introduces two Borel parameters T_{1} and T_{2} .

C om bining Eqs. (21), (23), our duality assumption and making the double B orel transformation, one obtains the sum rule for (y) as follows;

$$M f_{1=2} f_{b} e^{-2T^{0}} e^{-2T^{0}}$$

Now the remaining thing is to evaluate the relevant diagrams in Fig. 1. The leading contributions are given in [12]. For the subleading corrections to the perturbative spectral density function $(!;!)^{0}$; y), we have

$$(!;!^{0};y) = \hat{B}_{1=!}^{z^{0}} \hat{B}_{1=!}^{z} \hat{B}_{1=z^{0}}^{!} \hat{B}_{1=z}^{!} \text{ pert}$$

$$= \frac{6N_{c} \text{lai}}{4} \frac{1}{2 \sinh^{7}} (!) (!^{0}) (2y!^{0}! !^{2} !^{2})$$

$$= \frac{2v v^{0}}{\sinh^{2}} \frac{2 \cosh A^{3}B^{3}}{3B!} \frac{e A^{2}B^{4}}{2!4!} \frac{e A^{4}B^{2}}{4!2!}$$

$$+ \frac{2v v}{\sinh^{2}} \frac{e^{2} A^{4}B^{2}}{4!2!} + \frac{e^{2} A^{2}B^{4}}{2!4!} \frac{2A^{3}B^{3}}{3!3!} g \frac{A^{3}B^{3}}{3!3!} ; \quad (32)$$

from the perturbative diagram Fig.1 (a), where

$$i_{c} (c) + i_{b} (b);$$
 (33a)

A
$$!^{0}$$
 !e ; B !e $!^{0}$; (33b)

e
$$y + \frac{p}{y^2} \frac{1}{1}$$
: (33c)

For the condensate contributions we just give results when $T^0 = T$ for simplicity;

$$\hat{B}_{2T}^{!\,0} \hat{B}_{2T}^{!} \quad ^{hqqi} = \frac{ibg}{2^{-2} (1 + y)^{2}} \quad 64hqqiT^{5} \quad \frac{1}{3}hqg \quad G qiT^{3} (4y + 5=2)$$

$$\frac{ibv}{4^{-2} (1 + y)^{3}} \quad 128hqqiT^{5} (3v + 2v^{0})$$

$$+ \frac{4}{3}hqg \quad G qi (6y + 7=2)v + (y \quad 3=2)v^{0} \quad ; \quad (34a)$$

$$\frac{ihqq}{4} \quad G qiT^{3} \quad h$$

$$\hat{B}_{2T}^{!\,0} \hat{B}_{2T}^{!} \stackrel{hgg \ G \ qi}{=} \frac{i dh \ g \ G \ qil^{p}}{12 \ (1 + y)^{3}} \qquad 2g \ (2y^{2} + 3y + 1) + (10y + 6)v \ v \ + 4yv \ v^{0} \ ; (34b)$$

$$\hat{B}_{2T}^{!\,0} \hat{B}_{2T}^{!} \stackrel{h \ sG \ G \ i}{=} \frac{i ah \ sG \ G \ iT^{4}}{192 \ ^{3} \ (1 + y)^{5}} \qquad h \ 8(y + 1)^{2} \ (y \ 2)f \ g \ + 5v \ (v + v^{0}) \ g \ i \ + 24 \ (y \ 1)v \ v^{0} \qquad 16(y + 1) \ (y + 4)v \ v \ i \ \frac{i ah \ sG \ G \ iT^{4}}{512 \ ^{3} \ (1 + y)^{4}} \qquad h \ 2(1 + y)g \ + 6v \ (v + v^{0}) \ i \ (34c)$$

Note that these results are from $\frac{1}{2}$. If $\frac{3}{2}$ were the nalstate, would be replace by a proper -structure, leaving all the other things unchanged.

IV . R E SU LT S A N D D ISC U SS IO N S

For the num erical analysis, the standard values of the condensates are used;

hqqi =
$$(0.23 \text{ GeV})^3$$
;
hGGi = 0.04 GeV^4 ;
hqg Gqi m₀²hqqi; m₀² = 0.8 GeV^2 : (35)

There are many parameters engaged in the QCD sum rule calculations. The key point in the num erical analysis is to nd a reasonable parameter space where the QCD sum rule results are stable. First, the continuum threshold $\binom{0}{c}$ in $f_{\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2})}$ (⁰) can dier from that in f_{b} ().

However, it is expected that the values of $!_c$ and $!_c^0$ would not be di erent signi cantly. This is because the mass di erence ⁰ is fairly small [10], ⁰ ' 0.2 GeV. Indeed the central values of them were close to each other in the sum rules analysis for $f_{\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2})}$ (⁰) and f_{b} (). One more thing to be noticed here is that the continuum threshold $!_c$ in Eq. (30) can be a function of y in general. But for simplicity, we take it to be a constant $!_c(y) = !_c = !_c^0 = !_0$ in the num erical analysis. In this sense, we use only one constant continuum threshold throughout the analysis. An alternative choice of $!_c(y) = (1+y)!_0=2y$ is suggested in Ref. [20]. We nd that this choice yields alm ost no num erical di erences. This is because the kinem atically allowed region is very narrow around the zero recoil.

Second, there are input parameters of a and b in the interpolating elds in Eq. (15). They are the parameters that generalize pseudoscalar or axial-vector nature of the light degrees of freedom ($_{1=2;3=2}$ in Eq. 15). In Ref. [10], a particular choice of (a;b) = (1;0) gives the best stability for the mass parameter 0 . We adopt the same choice of (a;b) = (1;0) in the present analysis.

Third, there are two Borel parameters T_1 and T_2 distinct in general, corresponding to ! and !⁰ in (!;!⁰;y), respectively. We have taken $T_1 = T_2$ in the analysis. In Ref. [16] for B into excited charmed meson transition, the authors found a 10% increase in the leading IW function at zero recoil when $T_2=T_1 = 1.5$ as compared to the case when $T_1 = T_2$. It seems quite reasonable for one to expect that in the case of heavy baryon, the num erical results should be similar for the small variations around $T_2=T_1 = 1$.

In short, we adopt the same parameters used in [10,12] where the mass parameter and the leading IV function are calculated. It makes sense because the observables involved are directly related to the subleading IV function (y) through Eq. (30).

In Fig. 2, is plotted as a function of (y;T). Figure 3 shows the stability of (y = 1) for the Borel parameter. The sum rule window is

$$0:1 T 1:0 (G eV)$$
: (36)

The upper and lower bounds are xed such that the pole contribution amounts to 50% while

the condensate one to 12%. One notes that the window given in Eq. (36) overlaps those obtained in the Refs. [9,10,12]. Of course, this rejects the self-consistency of the sum rule analysis. In Fig. 4, we present the shape of (y) for a xed Borel parameter. We found that

$$(y) = (1) [1 2 (y 1)];$$

$$(1) = 127_{+0:18}^{0:17} \text{ GeV}; \text{ for } !_{0} = 1:4 \quad 0:1 \text{ GeV};$$

$$^{2} = 2:76_{+0:008}^{0:004}; \text{ for } !_{0} = 1:4 \quad 0:1 \text{ GeV}: \qquad (37)$$

V.SUMMARY

Subleading contributions of $(1=m_Q)$ to the $b_{\rm b}$ density of $c_{\rm cl}$ weak form factors are important because some of the form factors do not survive at the heavy quark limit, and other remaining form factors vanish at zero recoil. Using the QCD sum rules, we calculate the subleading IW function (y) which appears in the current matching in the HQET at O $(1=m_Q)$. We obtain (y) given by

$$(y) = 1.27 [1 \ 2.76 (y \ 1)] G eV$$
: (38)

The best stability is attained when the continuum threshold $!_0 = 1:4 \text{ GeV}$. The parameter space for the analysis is the same as previous one for the leading W function. The fact that by using the same set of parameters the present sum rule window for the mass parameter, leading and NLO W function overlaps the previous ones ensures the self-consistency of the QCD sum rules. Our results can be applied directly to the decay mode $_{\rm b}$! $_{\rm cl}$ ', along with the use of the previous LO W function, but a complete analysis at O (1=m_Q) requires the information on another NLO contributions from the HQET Lagrangian.

A cknow ledgem ents

This work was supported by the BK 21 Program of the K orean M inistry of E ducation. The work of GTP was supported in part by Yonsei University Research Fund of 2000.

A firer a simple algebra, possible contractions for are given by

$$v^{0} = 0;$$

$$v v^{(V)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{2} 2yv_{5} \frac{i}{2} \frac{1+v}{2};$$

$$v v^{0}^{(V)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{2} (v - 1) - 5 - 2v_{5} \frac{1+v}{2};$$

$$g^{(V)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{3} - \frac{i}{5} \frac{1+v}{2};$$

$$v v^{(A)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{-2} 2yv + 2 \frac{i}{2} \frac{1+v}{2};$$

$$v v^{(A)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{-2} (v + 1) - 2v^{i} \frac{1+v}{2};$$

$$g^{(A)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{3} \frac{1+v}{2};$$

$$v v^{(W)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{-2} (1-y) - 5 - 2v - 5 - 2(y + 1)v^{0} - 5 \frac{1+v}{2};$$

$$g^{(W)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{-2} (1-y) - 5 + 2v - 5 - 2(y + 1)v^{0} - 5 \frac{1+v}{2};$$

$$q v v^{(A)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{-2} (1-y) - 5 + 2v - 5 - 2(y + 1)v^{0} - 5 \frac{1+v}{2};$$

$$q v v^{(A)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{-2} (1-y) - 5 + 2v - 5 - 2(y + 1)v^{0} - 5 \frac{1+v}{2};$$

$$q v v^{(A)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{-2} (y + 1) - 2v - \frac{1+v^{0}}{2};$$

$$v v^{(A)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{-2} (y + 1) - 2v + 2(y - 1)v^{0} \frac{1+v}{2};$$

$$q v^{(A)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{-2} + 2v^{0} \frac{1+v^{0}}{2};$$

$$q e^{(A)} = \frac{1+v^{0}}{2} h^{-2} + 2v^{0} \frac{1+v^{0}}{2};$$

$$(A1)$$

where
$$V(A)$$
 ($_5$).

REFERENCES

- [1] D.E.Groom et al. (Particle Data Group), Eur. Phys. JC 15 (2000) 1.
- [2] H.Albrecht et al. (ARGUS Collaboration), Phys.Lett.B 317 (1993) 227; P.L.Frabetti et al. (E 687 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 72 (1994) 961; K.W. Edwards et al. (CLEO Collaboration), Phys.Rev.Lett. 74 (1995) 3331; J.P.Alexander et al. (CLEO Collaboration), Phys.Rev.Lett. 83 (1999) 3390.
- [3] N. Isgur and M. B. W ise, Phys. Lett. B 232 (1989) 113; ibid. 237 (1990) 527;
 - E.V.Shuryak, ibid. 93B (1980) 134;
 - H.Georgi, ibid.B 240 (1990) 447;
 - E.Eichten and B.Hill, ibid. B 234 (1990) 511;
 - M.B.Voloshin and M.A.Shifman, Yad. Fiz. 45 (1987) 463; ibid. 47 (1988) 801;
 - S.Nussinov and W.Wetzel, Phys.Rev.D 36 (1987) 130;
 - A.F.Falk, H.Georgi, B.Grinstein and M.B.W ise, Nucl. Phys. B 343 (1990) 1.
- [4] N. Isgur and M. B. W ise, Nucl. Phys. B 348 (1991) 276; H. Georgi, ibid. (1991) 293;
 J.P. Lee, C. Liu, and H. S. Song, Phys. Rev. D 58 (1998) 014013.
- [5] T.Mannel, W.Roberts, and Z.Ryzak, Phys.Lett.B 271 (1991) 421; Y.B.Dai, X.H. Guo, and C.-S.Huang, Nucl. Phys. B 421 (1994) 277.
- [6] P. Cho, Phys. Lett. B 285 (1992) 145; J.-P. Lee, C. Liu, and H.S. Song, Phys. Rev. D 61 (1999) 014006.
- [7] C.-S. Huang, C.-F. Qiao, and H.-G. Yan, Phys. Lett. B 437 (1998) 403; C.-S. Huang and H.-G. Yan, Phys. Rev. D 59 (1999) 114022.
- [8] M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein and V. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B 147 (1979) 385; ibid. (1979)
 448.
- [9] A.G.Grozin and O.I.Zakovlev, Phys.Lett. B 285 (1992) 254; E.V. Shuryak, Nucl. Phys. B 198 (1982) 83; B.Bagan, M. Chabab, H.G.Dosch, and S.Narison, Phys.Lett.

B 301 (1993) 243; Y.-B. Dai, C.-S. Huang, C. Liu, and C.-D. Lu, Phys. Lett. B 371 (1996) 99; Y.-B. Dai, C.-S. Huang, M.-Q. Huang, and C. Liu, ibid., 387 (1996) 379; S. Groote, J.G. Komer, and O. I. Yakovlev, Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) 3016; D 56 (1997) 3943.

- [10] J.P.Lee, C.Liu, and H.S.Song, Phys. Lett. B 476 (2000) 303.
- [11] S.-L. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D 61 (2000) 114019;
 C.-S. Huang, A. Zhang and S.-L. Zhu, Phys. Lett. B 492 (2000) 288.
- [12] M.-Q. Huang, J.-P. Lee, C. Liu, H.S. Song, Phys. Lett. B 502 (2000) 133.
- [13] A.K. Leibovich, Z. Ligeti, IW . Stewart, M.B.W ise, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78 (1997) 3995; Phys. Rev. D 57 (1997) 308.
- [14] P.Colangelo, F.De Fazio, N Paver, Phys. Rev. D 58 (1998) 116005.
- [15] M.-Q. Huang, Y.-B. Dai, Phys. Rev. D 59 (1999) 034018.
- [16] M.-Q. Huang, C.-Z. Li, Y.-B. Dai, Phys. Rev. D 61 (2000) 054010; M.-Q. Huang, Y.-B. Dai, Phys. Rev. D 64 (2001) 014034.
- [17] W.Y.Wang, Y.L.Wu, Int. J.M od. Phys. A 16 (2001) 2505.
- [18] A.F.Fak, Nucl. Phys. B 378 (1992) 79.
- [19] A.K. Leibovich and IW . Stewart, Phys. Rev. D 57 (1998) 5620.
- [20] M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D 45 (1992) 2451.
- [21] B.Blok and M. Shifm an, Phys. Rev. D 47 (1993) 2949.

Fig.1

Feynm an diagram s for the three-point function with derivative interpolating elds. D ouble line denotes the heavy quark.

Fig.2

Three dimensional plot of as a function of y and T in units of GeV. The continuum threshold is chosen to be $!_{c}(y) = 1.4 \text{ GeV}$.

Fig.3

(1) as a function of the Borel parameter T. Each graph corresponds to $!_0 = 12;13;14;15;1:6 \text{ GeV}$, respectively, from the top.

Fig.4

(y) at a xed Borel parameter T = 0.34. Each graph corresponds to $!_0 = 12;13;14;15;1:6 \text{ GeV}$, respectively, from the top.

FIGURES







FIG.1.



FIG.2.



FIG.3.



FIG.4.